



(1)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art Unit:	2142)	
)	
Serial No.:	09/917,108)	
)	
Examiner:	Reid, C.)	APPLICANTS' RESPONSE
)	
Inventor:	Pollack, R.)	TO THE FIRST
)	
Filed:	07/27/2001)	OFFICE ACTION
)	
Title:	<i>Method Of Aggregating,</i>)	
	<i>Classifying, Reporting And</i>)	
	<i>Cross-Tabbing Data, In</i>)	
	<i>Real Time</i>)	

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Responsive to the First Office Action on the merits of the above referenced Application mailed on November 23, 2004, Applicants respond as follows:

1) Responsive to the First Office Action's Paragraph 1 objections to claims 16 and 20, a complete set of claims indicating the changes to made to the letters "m" and "n" in claims 15 and 19 (the claims with the multiple "m" subheadings objected to by the Examiner) accompanies Applicant's Response to the First Office Action. Additionally, claims 20 and 21 have been amended to refer to independent claim 19.

2) Responsive to the First Office Action's Paragraph 2 objection to claim 22, Applicants' Application contains only 21 claims. Therefore, the Examiner's objection is incapable of a response by Applicants.

3) In response to Paragraph 3 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2 and 9 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al. and Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly in rejecting claims 1, 2, and 9, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001. Thus, Kelly is not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on Kelly in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claims 1, 2, and 9 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claims 1, 2 and 9 in condition for allowance.

4) In response to Paragraph 4 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 3 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly and Published Patent Application No. 2003/105658 A1-Chen, et al. in rejecting claim 3, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001. Thus, Kelly is not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on Kelly in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claim 3 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claim 3 in condition for allowance.

5) In response to Paragraph 5 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 4 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly, Published Patent Application No. 2003/105658 A1-Chen, et al. and Published Patent Application No. 2003/0055707-Busche, et al. in rejecting claim 4, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001. Thus, Kelly is not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on Kelly in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claim 4 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claim 4 in condition for allowance.

6) In response to Paragraph 6 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 5 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly, Published Patent Application No. 2003/105658 A1-Chen, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0055707-Busche, et al. and Published Patent Application No. 2003/0018515 A1-Guler, et al. in rejecting claim 5, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001 and that Guler, et al. has an effective filing date of July 10, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001 and July 10, 2001, respectively. Thus, Kelly and Guler, et al. are not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on either Kelly or Guler, et al. in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claim 5 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claim 5 in condition for allowance.

7) In response to Paragraph 7 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 14 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly, Published Patent Application No. 2003/105658 A1-Chen, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0055707-Busche, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0018515 A1-Guler, et al. and US Patent 6,584,548 B1-Bourne, et al. in rejecting claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 14, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001 and that Guler, et al. has an effective filing date of July 10, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001 and July 10, 2001, respectively. Thus, Kelly and Guler, et al. are not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on either Kelly or Guler, et al. in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 14 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 14 in condition for allowance.

8) In response to Paragraph 8 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 9 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly and Published Patent Application No. 2003/0018515 A1-Guler, et al. in rejecting claim 9, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001 and that Guler, et al. has an effective filing date of July 10, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001 and July 10, 2001, respectively. Thus, Kelly and Guler, et al. are not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on either Kelly or Guler, et al. in

making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claim 9 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claim 9 in condition for allowance.

9) In response to Paragraph 9 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 13 and 15 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly, Published Patent Application No. 2003/0055707-Busche, et al. and Published Patent Application No. 2003/0018515 A1-Guler, et al. in rejecting claims 13 and 15, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001 and that Guler, et al. has an effective filing date of July 10, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001 and July 10, 2001, respectively. Thus, Kelly and Guler, et al. are not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on either Kelly or Guler, et al. in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claims 13 and 15 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claims 13 and 15 in condition for allowance.

10) In response to Paragraph 10 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 17 and 21 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly, Published Patent Application No. 2003/0055707-Busche, et al. and Published Patent Application No. 2003/0018515 A1-Guler, et al. in rejecting claims 17 and 21, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001 and that Guler, et al. has an effective filing date of July 10, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001 and July 10, 2001, respectively. Thus, Kelly and

Guler, et al. are not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on either Kelly or Guler, et al. in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claims 17 and 21 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claims 17 and 21 in condition for allowance.

11) In response to Paragraph 11 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 19 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly, Published Patent Application No. 2003/105658 A1-Chen, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0055707-Busche, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0018515 A1-Guler, et al. and US Patent 6,584,548 B1-Bourne, et al. in rejecting claim 19, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001 and that Guler, et al. has an effective filing date of July 10, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001 and July 10, 2001, respectively. Thus, Kelly and Guler, et al. are not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on either Kelly or Guler, et al. in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claim 19 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claim 19 in condition for allowance.

12) In response to Paragraph 12 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 16 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly, Published Patent Application No. 2003/0018515 A1-Guler, et al. and US Patent 6,584,548 B1-Bourne, et al. in rejecting claim 16, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001 and that Guler, et al. has an effective

filing date of July 10, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001 and July 10, 2001, respectively. Thus, Kelly and Guler, et al. are not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on either Kelly or Guler, et al. in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claim 16 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claim 16 in condition for allowance.

13) In response to Paragraph 13 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 18 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly, Published Patent Application No. 2003/0055707-Busche, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0018515 A1-Guler, et al. and US Patent 6,584,548 B1-Bourne, et al. in rejecting claim 18, the record reveals that Kelly has an effective filing date of January 19, 2001 and that Guler, et al. has an effective filing date of July 10, 2001, and Applicants' Affidavit, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, establishes that Applicants' invention was reduced to practice prior to January 19, 2001 and July 10, 2001, respectively. Thus, Kelly and Guler, et al. are not prior art, and the Examiner cannot rely on either Kelly or Guler, et al. in making a sustainable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection. As a matter of law, the Examiner's rejection of pending claim 18 must be withdrawn, thereby placing claim 18 in condition for allowance.

14) In response to Paragraph 14 of the First Office Action and without waving Applicants' rights to argue the merits of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 20 in which the Examiner has combined US Patent 6,477,504 B1-Hamlin, et al., Published Patent Application No. 2003/0088452 A1-Kelly, Published Patent Application No. 2003/0018515 A1-Guler, et al. and US Patent 6,584,548 B1-Bourne, et al. in rejecting claim 20, the record reveals